

Date: Sun, 12 Dec 93 04:12:47 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1453  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Sun, 12 Dec 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 1453

Today's Topics:

                    10-Codes (with 36/37 fixed)  
                    ARRL's callsign admin position (3 msgs)  
                                HDN Releases  
                                Scratchi  
                    Scratchi, January, 1960 (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 11 Dec 93 11:23:05 GMT  
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!BIX.com!arog@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 10-Codes (with 36/37 fixed)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In the post re: 10 Codes, 10-10 was given as "flight in progress."  
10-10 is more commonly "out of service, subject to call" here on  
the left.coast.

-----  
Alan Ogden, w6spk  
arog@BIX.com moderator of ham.radio  
-----

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 93 18:42:01 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <DTD8Dc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,  
Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:  
>For the purposes of some recent proposals, I believe, W5YI represented  
>itself as an organization (quoting a membership of all it's  
>subscribers). And W5YI is a VEC, does he do all the work himself?

God, that's a stretch. What does he do for his subscribers besides send him a newsletter every N weeks? As for the VEC, he formed a non-profit corporation for that specific purpose.

>But, maybe you are right, we need a second national ham group. Anyone  
>wanna help me start one?

Not me; I'd rather fix the one we have.

>I said "totally".

And I meant what I said: the FCC was going to take some spectrum away from us, facts be damned. If that isn't totally adversarial, I don't know what is.

>Private interests had SOMETHING to do with it.

They didn't start it, though...the FCC did, internally.

>Jay, I honestly hope that our relationship with the FCC is not as bad as  
>you say (in fact I know it is not from the dealings our area hams have  
>with the FCC). If it were, Amateur Radio would be lost.

The difference there is that the local FCC types are generally sympathetic to ham radio...but it's not them that makes policy: it's the ones in Washington, and it's those folks who have decided that ham radio isn't worth screwing with. They are the ones to whom we need to present a united front.

>I can agree to some of what you said. United front and all. But before  
>the ARRL decides what all amateurs want, maybe they could come out of  
>the board room and ask a few of us?

Have you told your director what you think lately?

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"The road to Usenet is littered with dead horses." -- Jack Hamilton

-----

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 93 16:34:48 EST

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!  
mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> To put it bluntly, I'll misquote LBJ: Would you rather be on the inside of th  
> tent pissing out, or on the outside pissing in?

I would rather be up-hill pissing down-hill...

--

```
-----  
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----  
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |  
-----
```

-----  
Date: Wed, 8 Dec 93 00:37:53 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <L445Dc2w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,  
Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:  
>The do NOT represent "\_all\_" hams.

If they don't, who does? I guarandamntee you that \_someone\_ must, or else we  
are sunk.

> They do not pepresent me at this time  
>and there are MANY hams that I know who are not memebers of the ARRL.  
>Although, as I have previously stated, I feel that the ARRL is doing a  
>pretty good job of late, I tend to agree with Greg in that the ARRL  
>seems to feel that they are the 'one true voice of all amateur radio'.  
>They are NOT. They may represent a good portion, maybe a majority, but  
>in NO way do they represent ALL Amateurs!

Someone does. That someone is the ARRL, by default if nothing else.

>As I said, I have been impressed of late and am considering sending the  
>ARRL a dues check. However there are may organizations that represent a

>good number of amateurs (W5YI as an example).

Hate to tell you this, guy, but Fred Maia, W5YI, is not an organization - he's a newsletter publisher.

The only groups I'm aware of that even try to be a national voice are QCWA - which, by definition, only represents those who were hams at least 25 years ago (and therefore neither me nor you) - and Don Stoner's NARA, which is explicitly aimed at the new ham.

> Now, the other  
>organizations have not been around as long as the ARRL and are just  
>getting started. However they are growing. The age of the ARRL being the  
>exclusive national ham organization is long past.

There is NO other national ham organization designed for all.

>If my congressman called the FCC it would make an impact. And believe  
>you, me, MY congressman is willing to listen to those of us who sent  
>him to DC.

...but is your congressman aware of how hams around the country feel about issues, and the national importance of ham radio? There's a fundamental difference between Dan pickersgill, constituent, and ham radio. We need both.

>W5YI and all the other groups that have proposed to take over the  
>'vanity licensing' proposal.

The League had valid points, even if the overall presentation let something to be desired. (Yes, I have let my director know what I thought of that.) Again, none of those groups are for all hams; they're for some subset of hams.

> Wayne Green bashing is as usefull as ARRL  
>bashing (less in fact, Wayne Green isn't claiming to be the 'one true  
>voice of amateurs').

...not to mention that Wayne Green is much more of a buffoon than anyone with the League ever thought of being.

>Since when has our (amateur community) relationship with the FCC become  
>totally adversarial?

220 MHz.

If you don't understand that, you have completely missed the essential bureaucratic mindset. That grab was the result of a bureaucracy run amok, and bureaucracies don't forget.

>As I have said, the ARRL is improving. (Can we get rid of incentive  
>licensing now guys? Like the social programs of the 60's, it isn't in  
>the national interest.) (There I said it, look out now!)

I'd flame that one, but it's been hashed over quite a bit as it is; short form  
answer is that while we're implementing the welfare state in ham licensing, we  
might as well do away with that too. (That was sarcasm.)

>No. Just honest and truly representative of its members.

Again, you totally fail to understand the bureaucratic mindset. Any group that  
comes across as fragmented to a bureaucrat will get completely ignored.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"The road to Usenet is littered with dead horses." -- Jack Hamilton

-----  
Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1993 21:45:05  
From: @uunet.uu.net@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: HDN Releases  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The following files were processed Thursday 12-09-93:

HAMDEMO [ HAM: Amateur Radio Demo Progs ]

-----  
COIL112.EXE ( 33660 bytes) Single layer Air-core inductor  
calculator V1.12 by K6STI

-----  
33660 bytes in 1 file(s)

HAMLOG [ HAM: Amateur radio logging programs ]

-----  
HLOG222E.EXE ( 350353 bytes) HyperLog V2.22e Logging Program  
WRITEL.ZIP ( 837466 bytes) Windows Logging Program - updated  
drivers

-----  
1187819 bytes in 2 file(s)

HAMNEWS [ HAM: Bulletins and Newsletters ]

COND0007.LZH ( 3769 bytes) Condo Newsletter #7  
OPDX138.LZH ( 3220 bytes) Ohio-Pa Packet Cluster DX Bulletin  
12/06/93

-----  
6989 bytes in 2 file(s)

HAMPACK [ HAM: Packet Communications programs ]

-----  
EZPKT\_17.ZIP ( 63351 bytes) EZ Packet V1.17 term program for  
PMP modems by N9MXI

-----  
63351 bytes in 1 file(s)

HAMSAT [ HAM: Satellite tracking and finding programs ]

-----  
AMSAT338.LZH ( 2745 bytes) AMSAT Bulletin # 338 12/04/93  
ARLK051.LZH ( 2014 bytes) ARRL Keps 12/04/93  
OBS337.LZH ( 5510 bytes) Amsat Orbital Elements # 337  
12/03/93  
SPC1206.LZH ( 3232 bytes) SPACE Bulletin 12/06/93

-----  
13501 bytes in 4 file(s)

HAMUTIL [ HAM: Radio operating aids ]

-----  
TIMEZ.ZIP ( 86682 bytes) Track World Time by Steve Mount

-----  
86682 bytes in 1 file(s)

Total of 1392002 bytes in 11 file(s)

Files are available via Anonymous-FTP from ftp.fidonet.org  
IP NET address 140.98.2.1

Directories are:

pub/fidonet/ham/hamnews (Bulletins)  
/hamant (Antennas)  
/hamsat (Sat. prg/Amsat Bulletins)  
/hampack (Packet)  
/hamelec (Formulas)

/hamtrain (Training Material)  
/hamlog (Logging Programs)  
/hamcomm (APLink/JvFax/Rtty/etc)  
/hammods (Equip modification)  
/hamswl (SWBC Skeds/Frequencies)  
/hamscan (Scanner Frequencies)  
/hamutil (Operating aids/utils)  
/hamsrc (Source code to programs)  
/hamdemo (Demos of new ham software)  
/hamnos (TCP/IP and NOS related software)

Files may be downloaded via land-line at (214) 226-1181 or (214) 226-1182.  
1.2 to 16.8K, 23 hours a day .

When ask for Full Name, enter: Guest;guest <return>

lee - wa5eha  
Ham Distribution Net

\* Origin: Ham Distribution Net Coordinator / Node 1 (1:124/7009)

-----  
Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1993 10:45:37 -0800  
From: Tony Zugec <tonyz@hpwrce.mayfield.hp.com>  
Subject: Scratchi  
To: greg@netcom.com

Greg, thankyou for so eloquently saying what  
I wanted to say, but am too mad. I am afraid that  
in my rage, I will only embarrass myself.

I can't understand why some people can just  
pass this type of racism off as "just in fun".

It wasn't fun when I was a kid, having other  
kids ridicule me as being half asian, slanting  
their eyes, speaking in 'scratchi' and making  
fun of my mother. It really hurt, I guess they  
will never understand. So, I appreciate  
the intelligent manner in which you present  
your argument. I hope some of them get a  
clue, but I doubt it.

Tony WB6TRU  
-----

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 93 00:39:50 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Scratchi, January, 1960  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Political correctness rears its ugly head. That article was from 1960, ferchrissakes! Anyone who gets offended by that article, much less thinks it reflects current ham thinking, has too high an offensensitivity quotient.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.  
"The road to Usenet is littered with dead horses." -- Jack Hamilton

-----

Date: 8 Dec 93 11:45:36  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!nigel.msen.com!ilium!rcsuna.gmr.com!  
rcsuna.gmr.com!vbreault@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Scratchi, January, 1960  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hmmm....

There I go again....

Opening my mouth when I should have just sat by and waited a piece.

Thanks to the many people that took the time to drop me a note explaining the origin of the Scratchi character. I now understand that he was a stereotypical Japanese man and I understand how some people may feel embarrassed of threatened by reposting old Scratchi articles.

I also understand that many people keep their feelings much closer to the surface than I do. I can't imagine how painful it must be to live that way. Like ill fitting underwear, the trials of living in our society must chafe the sensibilities of those individuals.

Perhaps that's why some of those folks seem to be so crabby. Under similar circumstances I guess I would be too.

I don't have an answer to the PC issue. On the one hand I try to be kind to everyone I meet, never wishing to hurt anyones feelings. On the other hand realizing that the various ethnic groups' characteristics have made this melting pot the nation it is.



I fear that one day it will be illegal (we will not have the freedom) to discriminate at all. We will not be permitted to refer to anyones heritage in any way for fear of violating their sensibilities. Words like German, Italian, Chinese will be stricken from our vocabulary.

Before that day comes though I'll continue to remember and continue to profit by the characteristics of the numerous ethnic groups that live in the greater Detroit area.

For example: The fine Polish folks that live in and around Hamtramc, Michigan. Theirs is a legacy of industrious men who worked hard and played hard and their wives who care for their homes with so much vigor that (even to this day) they sweep the street in front of their home. They raised children who were quire aware of the tradition of a fair days work for a fair days pay.

Yes, I've heard and even told some of those infamous Polish jokes.

I guess I'm a bigot.

Both for telling the occasional joke (not representative of all Polish people) and for the stereotypical view of Polish industry (again, not entirely representative).

ObRadio:

I think I'll try the center fed wire this weekend and see how it works out. It sounds easy enough. Just connect the shield and the center conductor to the hot terminal on my tuner and hope my ground system will provide a suitable counterpoise. Can you say "RF in the shack?"

--

Val Breault - N80EF - vbreault@gmr.com \ /|  
Instrumentation dept GM NAO R&D Center \ / |  
My opinions are not necessarily those of \ /\_\_|  
GMR nor of the General Motors Corporation \ / |\_\_\_

-----

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 93 22:09:30 GMT  
From: xn.ll.mit.edu!ll.mit.edu!wjc@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec7.234425.4647@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<1993Dec8.184205.20082@ll.mit.edu>, <1993Dec9.162128.12183@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: hypochondriac scared of cancer!

In article <1993Dec9.162128.12183@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

```

|>
|> ...whole bunches of stuff deleted...
|>
|> Note I didn't make the assumption that the antenna was isotropic.
|> I assumed it to be a dipole oriented perpendicular to the line of
|> sight to the window. A purpose of an antenna is to act as an impedance
|> matching device between the transmission line impedance and that of free
|> space. Since we know that the maximum voltage will appear across points
|> separated by 1/2 wave, and if we assume the antenna is perfect, then using
|>  $E = \sqrt{P_o \times R_{free}}$  should give us the voltage across a 1/2 wave of free
|> space in the plane perpendicular to our line of sight to the window,
|> *at the antenna*. I just realized I'm basically ignoring the fall off of
|> field strength in the first 1.44 meters. That's where the difference lies,
|> I can't do that. The number I got is the field strength at the dipole
|> *tips*. Double aaarrgh!
|>
|> > Radiated Power = 3,000 watts
|> >
|> > Surface Area of
|> > 100-foot-radius
|> > sphere centered
|> > on antenna = 125,664 ft^2
|> > = 11,675 m^2
|> >
|> > Power Flux = Power / Area = 0.2570 W/m^2
|> > = 2.570 mW/cm^2
|> >
|> 0.0257 mW/cm^2, you slipped the decimal too. :-)
|>
|> > Electric Field Strength = sqrt(Power Flux * Free-Space Impdnc)
|> > = sqrt(0.2570 W/m^2 * 377 ohms)
|> > = 9.84 V/m rms
|> >
|> > Note also that to convert from W/m^2 to mW/cm^2 you need to multiply
|> > by 10.
|>
|> Divide by 10. I don't see anything wrong with your approach, aside from
|> the slipped decimals. Our answers differ by about an order of magnitude.
|> That's because I screwed up assuming the field at the dipole was the
|> same as the field a bit over 1/2 wave away. It isn't. Just for grins,
|> let's do it another way and see how the answer falls out. Let's assume
|> the isotropic radiator to attempt to get the same answer. So 1 meter from
|> the radiator we have a sphere of  $4 \times \pi \times R^2$  or 12.57 square meters surface
|> area. That gives a power density of  $3000/12.57$  or 238.66 W/m^2 for a field
|> strength of  $\sqrt{238.66 \times 377}$  or 299.96 V/m. Now divide by 30.46 to get the
|> field strength at the window of 9.85 V/m. And that gives a power density at
|> the window of 0.257 W/m^2. Dividing by 10 we get 0.0257 mW/cm^2.
|>

```

|> Ah, convergence. We're singing from the same songbook now.  
|>  
|> Now isotropic radiators aren't real. If we assume a cylindrical pattern  
|> from a dipole perpendicular to our window with no end effects, (simplifying  
|> again), our field strength 1 meter from the antenna becomes 353.56 V/m. And  
|> that puts the field strength at the window at 11.61 V/m. the power density  
|> becomes 0.0358 mW/cm^2 which is almost the same as the number I stumbled  
|> into in my original post thanks to errors of assumption and slipped decimals.

Yes, I did blatantly blow the fact that Gary specified a half-wave dipole rather than an isotropic radiator.

In copying numbers from my calculator to my workstation, I dropped the exponent in the power density at 100 feet expressed in mW/cm^2, which led to my final statement about the W/m^2 to mW/cm^2 conversion factor being wrong. Just as I posted the message, I got a bad feeling about the order of magnitude --- hence my immediate followup to my first post (I trust that made it out).

Anyway, we now agree about the flux and field strength at 100 feet from an isotropic radiator. In the case of the half-wave dipole, we nearly agree.

We say the flux and field strength from the isotropic radiator are:

0.02570 mW/cm^2 and 9.84 V/m.

The gain of a half-wave dipole relative to the isotropic radiator is 2.14 dB (I'm presenting this as a given --- I'll listen to counterarguments). This represents a power ratio of:

$$10^{(2.14 / 10)} = 1.6368$$

and a voltage ratio of:

$$10^{(2.14 / 20)} = 1.2794.$$

Thus, the flux and field strength from the dipole (at 100 feet) are:

$$0.02570 \text{ mW/cm}^2 * 1.6368 = 0.04207 \text{ mW/cm}^2$$

and

$$9.84 \text{ V/m} * 1.2794 = 12.59 \text{ V/m}$$

Now we differ by only 0.7dB! Certainly the difference is in the right direction, given that you assumed the flux from the dipole is

evenly distributed over a cylindrical surface surrounding the dipole. It is interesting that the resulting error in field strength is only 8 percent. A single half-wave dipole just isn't very directive, eh?

73

Bill Chiarchiaro N1CPK  
wjc@ll.mit.edu

-----  
Date: Thu, 9 Dec 1993 19:47:44 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!news.kpc.com!amd!netcomsv!netcom.com!greg@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gregCHool3.Jt7@netcom.com>,  
<1993Dec8.192104.23873@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>, <2e5k37\$7v0@darkstar.UCSC.EDU>md  
Subject : Re: Scratchi, January, 1960

I received the following correspondence from a reader, and he has agreed to let me post it. It says more than I ever could. To the naysayers, and pc-baiters: if this doesn't make you understand, I'm afraid that nothing will. Now, Tony:

-----  
Date: 9 Dec 93 10:40:34 GMT  
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!eff!news.kei.com!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!BIX.com!arog@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec7.234425.4647@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<1993Dec8.184205.20082@ll.mit.edu>, <1993Dec8.185300.20583@ll.mit.edu>  
Subject : Re: hypochondriac scared of cancer!

All said and done, there is one simple observation [and I'm not sorry for bringing the 'real.world' into this.]

Where are all of the dead broadcast transmitter engineers? Most of the cancer deaths are, in my estimation, related to those of us that have been around that end of things for a long while having been elbow deep into chemicals that are now known to be real nasty, not from the RF. There are far too many folks that have all but lived on Mount Wilson where all of the Los Angeles TV stations

and a major number of the FM stations in this market live... that are in fine shape for all of what they've been exposed to.

But then, the folks that I know as well as myself are of the school that tells station managers that they need a new engineer when the told us that we couldn't turn things off when there was work that needed to be done up next to the antenna.

-----

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 1993 00:29:45 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
metropolis.gis.iastate.edu!willmore@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2651@arrl.org>, <9311292209592.gilbaronw@mn.DLITE@delphi.com>,  
<edh.754687121@hpuerca>  
Subject : Re: Repeater calling procedure (Was: Elm

edh@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Ed Humphries) writes:

>My \$.02 worth:  
>I've often heard people getting ribbed for calling CQ on a  
>repeater. It is, after all, a (shutter) imported from hf'ism  
>and (like QTH for "where are you now") \_can\_ rub people the  
>wrong way. Like Jay said, in Texas we always just assumed  
>that a "monitoring" meant the caller was open for conversation.  
>Around the Atlanta area I haven't heard CQ yet, but then again  
>I haven't had much luck scareing up a contact when I "monitor".

Just breathing near some peoples repeaters (supposedly open ones)  
can be grounds for getting the cold shoulder.

>But still, "monitoring" pretty simply says "Hi, I'm  
>currently listening on this freq and would be willing to talk  
>to some other amateur if they'd like to discuss pretty much any  
>subject." Whew! Now THAT would be silly!

Around here, it tends to mean "I'll be listening for a little  
while. If you would like to talk to me, feel free to. If you  
know me, why don't you come on and say 'hi'." It's sort of a  
passive CQ.

>MY biggest gripe is the guy yelling "testing. TESTING." and then  
>does not responding when I offer to help with a signal report.  
>Maybe their speakers are busted but their mic's are good?

How about 'test' means that they're testing say, the SWR on their antenna and they just need some carrier but they don't really want to leave dead air. Now, I could see you getting upset if they said 'check' and then ignored you. :)

As most people have said, proper repeater behavior varies with locality and even repeater to repeater. Listen for a while and then talk. (listen for weeks, not minutes...)

Cheers,  
David  
--

-----  
willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |  
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |  
-----

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1453

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*